



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/013,980	11/05/2001	Gust H. Bardy	032580.0060.CIP	3720
21691	7590	10/26/2005		
CROMPTON SEAGER AND TUFTE, LLC 1221 NICOLLET AVENUE SUITE 800 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55403-2420				
			EXAMINER SCHAETZLE, KENNEDY	
			ART UNIT 3766	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SP

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/013,980	BARDY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kennedy Schaetzle	3766	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 59-93 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 75-80 and 84-93 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 59, 61-63, 68-71 and 81 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 60, 64-67, 72-74, 82 and 83 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 59, 61, 62, 68-71 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Loeb (Pat. No. 6,112,124).

Loeb discloses an implantable lead electrode assembly comprising an electrode 50 (see Fig. 4) having a proximal end and a distal end, and top and bottom surfaces (the top surface of electrode 50 being that surface which contacts the backing layer 15, and the bottom surface being that surface directly opposite the top surface). A backing layer 15 is positioned over the top of electrode 50, the backing layer having top and bottom surfaces, wherein the bottom surface of the backing layer contacts the top surface of the electrode. The backing layer forms a fin 120 (see col. 4, lines 42-46) and the fin projects from the top surface of the backing layer. The electrode, backing layer and fin are adapted for implantation in the patient.

Regarding the language in the preamble concerning use with an implantable cardioverter/defibrillator, the examiner considers recitations of this nature in the preamble to constitute statements of intended use for the lead electrode assembly. In the absence of any structural recitation in the body of the claim limiting the lead electrode assembly to such an application, the claim fails to saliently distinguish over the apparatus defined by Loeb.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeb in view of Kuzma (Pat. No. 6,038,484).

Loeb does not explicitly discuss the use of a polyurethane backing layer. Polyurethane, however, is a biocompatible, insulative material well-known in the medical arts to provide structural support to and electrical isolation between electrodes. Kuzma, for example, teaches that silicone or polyurethane backing layers for implantable electrode lead structures of the type disclosed by Loeb are old and well-known in the art (col. 8, lines 13-33). Lacking any criticality in one insulative material over the other, those of ordinary skill in the art would have seen the selection of polyurethane as a backing material to be a matter of obvious design. Said material is relatively easy to manufacture, inexpensive, biocompatible, and provides the necessary electrical isolation. The courts have long determined that the selection of a material based on its suitability for use is obvious (see MPEP 2144.07).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 75-80 and 84-93 are allowed.

6. Claims 60, 64-67, 72-74, 82 and 83 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 60, there does not appear to be a teaching in the prior art of record for modifying the size of the Loeb electrodes or backing layer so as to make the backing layer substantially the same size as the electrode. A modification of this type would appear to destroy the operability of the Loeb device.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 59-65, 68-71, 75-77 and 79-83 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kennedy Schaetzle whose telephone number is 571 272-4954. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W and F from 9:30 -6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E. Pezzuto can be reached on M-F at 571 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3766

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KJS  
October 18, 2005



KENNEDY SCHAEETZLE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER